



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

H'A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,606	04/14/2005	Ramon Pascal Van Gorkom	NL 020913	8242
24737	7590	11/29/2006	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				HINES, ANNE M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2879		

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/531,606	VAN GORKOM ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anne M. Hines	2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/27/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the Search Report is not considered to be an information disclosure statement (IDS) complying with 37 CFR 1.98. 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) requires a legible copy of: (1) each foreign patent; (2) each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; (3) for each cited pending U.S. application, the application specification including claims, and any drawing of the application, or that portion of the application which caused it to be listed including any claims directed to that portion, unless the cited pending U.S. application is stored in the Image File Wrapper (IFW) system; and (4) all other information, or that portion which caused it to be listed. In addition, each IDS must include a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office (see 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) and (b)), and MPEP § 609.04(a), subsection I. states, "the list ... must be submitted on a separate paper." Therefore, the references cited in the Search Report have not been considered. Applicant is advised that the date of submission of any item of information or any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the IDS, including all "statement" requirements of 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by de Zwart et al. (EP 0 560 434 B1).

Regarding claim 1, de Zwart discloses a display device comprising a vacuum envelope (Column 1, lines 3-14), and inner side of which is provided with a luminescent display screen (Fig. 13, 7; Column 5, line 29), the vacuum envelope comprising at least an electron source for emitting electrons (Fig. 13, 111; Column 12, lines 5-6) and directing means for directing the electrons towards the display screen, the directing means comprising: an arrangement of at least three plates defining a network of electron transport ducts (Fig. 13, 113 & 100; Column 12, lines 5-30), a middle plate of the arrangement being provided with selection apertures and selection electrodes and selection electrodes associated with the selection apertures for application of selection voltages (Fig. 13, 10a; Column 6, lines 24-34), the directing means being arranged for selectively passing the electrons through the selection apertures and directing the electrons alternately at opposite sides of the middle plate, characterized in that an anti-leakage layer is provided for enabling an electric potential on a plate of the arrangement, the electric potential counteracting tunneling of electrons between the middle plate and an adjacent plate (Fig. 13, 10b & 214 & 214'; Column 7, line 51 to Column 8, line 13; Column 8, lines 30-52; Column 15, lines 6-10).

Regarding claim 2, de Zwart further discloses wherein the anti-leakage layer is formed by a passive anti-leakage layer (Fig. 13, 10b).

Regarding claim 6, de Zwart further discloses wherein the anti-leakage layer is formed by an active anti-leakage layer (Fig. 13, 214 & 214').

Regarding claim 7, de Zwart further discloses wherein at least some of the selection electrodes are arranged for functioning as the anti-leakage layer (Fig. 13, 10b & 214 & 214'; Column 8, lines 30-52; Column 15, lines 6-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Zwart et al. (EP 0 560 434 B1) in view of van Gorkom et al. (US 5723940).

Regarding claim 3, de Zwart teaches the invention of claim 2 but fails to teach wherein the facing sides of the plates are provided with a non-conductive coating having a secondary electron emission coefficient smaller than 1, at positions where no electron transport should take place.

In the same field of endeavor of flat panel displays with electron propagation ducts, van Gorkom teaches wherein the facing sides of plates are provided with a non-conductive coating having a secondary electron emission coefficient smaller than 1, at positions where no electron transport should take place (Fig. 6, 18; Column 7, lines 16-28; Column 7, lines 32-41) in order to ensure that the walls are poor secondary emitters

and to suppress field emission, thereby preventing electron transport at positions where no electron transport should take place (Column 7, lines 22-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of de Zwart to have the facing sides of the plates in the electron propagation ducts provided with a non-conductive coating having a secondary electron emission coefficient smaller than 1, at positions where no electron transport should take place, as disclosed by van Gorkom in order to ensure that the walls are poor secondary emitters and to suppress field emission, thereby preventing electron transport at positions where no electron transport should take place.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, de Zwart teaches the invention of claim 2 but fails to teach wherein some or all of the selection electrodes are at least partly covered with an insulating material.

In the same field of endeavor of flat panel displays with electron propagation ducts, van Gorkom teaches wherein selection electrodes are partially covered with an insulating material by providing an insulating layer between the selection electrodes and spacers (Fig. 6, 14; Column 6, lines 30-34; Column 6, lines 8-21) in order to avoid a short circuit between the different selection electrodes provide constant contact between the spacer and selection electrodes to prevent unwanted field emission from the spacers (Column 5, lines 44-57; Column 6, lines 30-34; Column 6, lines 8-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of de Zwart to have all of the selection electrodes are at least partly

covered with an insulating material in order to avoid a short circuit between the different selection electrodes provide constant contact between the spacer and selection electrodes to prevent unwanted field emission from the spacers, as disclosed by van Gorkom.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne M. Hines whose telephone number is (571) 272-2285. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Anne M Hines
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879

Xmt
11/09/06


NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800